



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

221
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,684	09/08/2003	Joachim Otto	13913-136001 / 2003P00412	2143
22852	7590	09/21/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			INGBERG, TODD D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,684	OTTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Todd Ingberg	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 20 have been examined

Oath/Declaration

1. The Examiner is requesting the information on the Declaration for the each Inventor be typed for the Office. The handwriting related to the Inventors is unreadable. No need for a new declaration, the current declaration is valid.

Drawings

2. The new formal drawings submitted June 1, 2004 have been accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to a signal directly or indirectly by claiming a medium and the Specification recites evidence where the computer readable medium is define as a “*wave*” (such as a carrier wave) . In that event, the claims are directed to a form of energy which at present the office feels does not fall into a category of invention. The following link on the World Wide Web is for the United States Patent And Trademark Office (USPTO) policy on 35 U.S.C. §101.

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognnotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3 –15, 17-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Template Software.

The **Template** product line contains:

The SNAP programming language (One manual used)

The Workflow Template (Not used in this Office Action)

The Web Component (One manual used)

These three layered products work together.

The documentation sets for the products contains the following manuals.

SNAP released June 1997

SNAP Language Reference (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Language (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Communication Component (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Graphic User Interface Component (Not used in this Office Action)

Getting Started with SNAP (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Display Editors (Not used in this Office Action)

SNAP Class Library Reference (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP External Application Software Component (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Development Environment (Referred to as **SNAP**)

SNAP Module Library Reference (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the SNAP Permanent Storage Component (Not used in this Office Action)

Workflow released September 1997

Developing a WFT Workflow System (Not used in this Office Action)

Using the WFT Development Environment (Not used in this Office Action)

WFT Library Reference (Not used in this Office Action)

Web Component

Using the Web Component (Referred to as **WEB**)

Since, these products work together they constitute a single reference and can be used as the basis for a rejection based on anticipated by a product offering.

Claim 1

Template anticipates a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising: receiving an original design-time representation of an application (SNAP, page 4-8, Creating a GUI) , the original design time representation for use in a first run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a first design-time environment (SNAP, page 4-9, Steps to make a GUI) , the first design-time environment using a first programming model comprising one or more first model elements including screens and processing logic for each screen, the original design-time representation including one or more application screens (SNAP, pages 4-10 to 4-25) and original processing logic for each application screen (SNAP, page 4-13, classes); and generating a converted design-time representation of the application based on the original design-time representation (SNAP, page 4-9) , WEB teaches the converted design-time representation for use in a second run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a second design-time environment (WEB, Chapter 2) , the second design-time environment using a second programming model comprising one or more second model elements including models (WEB, pages 2-13 to 2-19), views, and controllers (WEB, pages 2-3 to 2-5), the converted design-time representation including one or more application views based on the one or more application screens (WEB, pages 2-3 to 2-5), and converted processing logic based on the original

processing logic (WEB, pages 2-3 to 2-5), the converted processing logic capable of being executed in the second run-time environment (WEB, pages 2-1 to 2-5).

Claim 3

The computer program product of claim 1, wherein generating a converted design-time representation of the application comprises: converting each application screen to a corresponding application view ; and converting the original processing logic for each application screen to the converted processing logic. As per claim 1.

Claim 4

The computer program product of claim 3, wherein: each application screen comprises one or more controls from a first set of controls defined in the first programming model; the second programming model defines a second set of controls ; and converting each application screen comprises selecting a corresponding control from the second set of controls for each control in the application screen As per claim 1.

Claim 5

The computer program product of claim 4, wherein each control comprises an attribute , and wherein converting each application screen further comprises, for each control in the application screen , setting the attribute of the corresponding control to match the attribute of the control in the application screen As per claim 1.

Claim 6

The computer program product of claim 3, wherein the original processing logic comprises state control logic and one or more calls to one or more run-time modules in the first run-time environment , and wherein converting the original processing logic comprises: generating corresponding state control logic that is executable by an adapter in the second run-time environment , the adapter being operable to interface with the run-time modules in the first run-time environment ; and converting the calls to the run-time modules into instructions to the adapter for invoking the run-time modules As per claim 1.

Claim 7

The computer program product of claim 3, wherein converting the original processing logic comprises generating one or more instructions to an adapter in the second run-time environment to perform a function not performed by the original processing logic As per claim 1.

Claim 8

The computer program product of claim 3, wherein: converting the original processing logic comprises generating code to invoke an adapter in the second run-time environment; and the code to invoke the adapter is formatted to resemble the original processing logic As per claim 1.

Claim 9

The computer program product of claim 8, wherein the code to invoke the adapter comprises one or more macros (As per claim 1 – code to convert).

Claim 10

A system comprising: a first run-time environment operable to execute run-time code generated from design-time representations of applications developed in a first design-time environment, the first design-time environment using a first programming model comprising one or more first model elements including models, views, and controllers; a conversion module operable to: receive an original design-time representation of an application, the original design-time representation for use in a second run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a second design-time environment, the second design time environment using a second programming model comprising one or more second model elements including screens and processing logic for each screen, the original design-time representation including one or more application screens and original processing logic for each application screen, the original processing logic including a call to a run-time module in the second run-time environment; and generate a converted design-time representation of the application based on the original design-time representation, the converted design-time representation for use in the first run-time environment, the converted design-time representation including one or more application views based on the one or more application screens, and convert; processing logic based on the original processing logic, the converted processing logic capable of being executed in the first run-time environment; and an adapter operable to interface with the run-time module in the second run-time environment. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 11

The system of claim 10, wherein the converted processing logic comprises an instruction to the adapter to invoke the run-time module based on the call to the run-time module in the original processing logic. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 12

The system of claim 10, wherein: the first programming model defines a first set of controls; the second programming model defines a second set of controls; and the converted design-time representation of the application comprises a corresponding control from the first set of controls for each control in the original design-time representation of the application. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 13

The system of claim 10, wherein the converted processing logic comprises instructions that are formatted to resemble the original processing logic. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 14

The system of claim 10, wherein the converted design-time representation of the application comprises additional processing logic not included in the original processing logic. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 15

An apparatus comprising: means for receiving an original design-time representation of an application, the original design-time representation for use in a first run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a first design-time environment, the first design-time environment using a first programming model comprising one or more first model elements including screens and processing logic for each screen, the original design-time representation including one or more application screens and original processing logic for each application screen; and means for generating a converted design-time representation of the application based on the original design-time representation, the converted design-time representation for use in a second run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a second design-time environment, the second design-time environment using a second programming model comprising one or more second model elements including models, views, and controllers, the converted design-time representation including one or more application views based on the one or more application screens, and converted processing logic based on the original processing logic, the converted processing logic capable of being executed in the second run-time environment. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 17

The apparatus of claim 15, wherein the means for generating a converted design-time representation of the application comprises: means for converting each application screen to a corresponding application view; and means for converting the original processing logic for each application screen to the converted processing logic. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 18

A method comprising: receiving an original design-time representation of an application, the original design time representation for use. in a first run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a first design-time environment, the first design-time environment using a first programming model comprising one or more first model elements including screens and processing logic for each screen, the original design-time representation including one or more application screens and original processing logic for each application screen; and generating a ~ -averted design-time representation of the application based on the original design-time representation, the converted design-tune representation for use in second run-time environment for executing applications having been developed in a second design-time environment, the second design-time environment using a second programming model comprising one or more second model elements including models, views, and controllers, the converted design-time representation including one or more application views based on the one or more application screens, and converted processing logic based on the original processing logic, the converted processing logic capable of being executed in the second run-time environment. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim 20

The method of claim 18, wherein generating a converted design-time representation of the application comprises: converting each application screen to a corresponding application view;

and converting the original processing logic for each application screen to the converted processing logic. As per the rejection for claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) or 103(a) as being unpatentable over the commercial product line by Template Software in view of Development Tools.

The following is rejected under 102 and 103

Rejection under 103

Template teaches the ability to build GUIs in SNAP to run as a local application and how to Web enable them with the product WEB which enables them to run in another environment. therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to combine the product offerings of Template and use SNAP and enable the applications to run on the WWW, because web enabled applications provide access to do business on the WWW.

Claim 2

The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the first programming model is the SAP Dynpro programming model, and the second programming model is the SAP Web Dynpro programming model.

Examiner's Interpretation

Applicant knows best the undisclosed details of SAP Dynpro programming model and SAP Web Dynpro programming model. And if an Information Disclosure Statement is appropriate. The Examiner is presuming the Template SNAP environment meets the functional abilities of SAP Dynpro programming model and the WEB tool of Templates meets the functional abilities of SAP Web Dynpro programming model. Product names not given patentable weight.

Claim 16

The apparatus of claim 15, wherein the first programming model is the SAP Dynpro programming model, and the second programming model is the SAP Web Dynpro programming model. As per the rejection for claim 2.

Claim 19

The method of claim 18, wherein the first programming model is the SAP Dynpro programming model, and the second programming model is the SAP Web Dynpro programming model. As per the rejection for claim 2.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd Ingberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-3723. The examiner can normally be reached on during the work week..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,684
Art Unit: 2193

Page 10



Todd Ingberg
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2193

TI